

Erratum

Table 2

Comparison of λ_s and λ_s^* , at Different Levels of γ and p

Genetic Model, γ , and p^a	λ_s	λ_s^{*b}	λ_s^{*c}
Single-locus dominant:			
$\gamma = 5$:			
$p = .05$	<u>1.36</u>	2.28	2.95
$p = .20$	<u>1.29</u>	1.50	1.79
$\gamma = 20$:			
$p = .05$	<u>2.93</u>	3.97	5.51
$p = .20$	<u>1.64</u>	1.73	2.16

^a Epistatic models are as defined in table 1.

^b Proband has at least one susceptibility allele at putative disease locus.

^c Proband has both susceptibility alleles at putative disease locus.

In the February 2000 issue of the *Journal*, in the article “The Relationship between the Sibling Recurrence Risk-Ratio and Genotype Relative Risk,” by Rybicki and Elston (66:593–604) formulas A1 and A2 in the appendix were incorrect. The correct formulas are given below:

$$f_1 \left[K_0 \left(\frac{p^2 - 2p + 1}{4} \right) + K_G \left(1 - \frac{p^2 - 2p + 1}{4} \right) \right] \quad (A1)$$

$$+ f_2 \left[K_0 \left(\frac{p^2 - 3p + 2}{4} \right) + K_G \left(\frac{2 - p^2 + 3p}{4} \right) \right]$$

$$+ f_3 \left[K_0 \left(1 - p + \frac{p^2}{4} \right) + K_G \left(p - \frac{p^2}{4} \right) \right],$$

and

Table 4

Relationship between λ_s , γ , and Allele Sharing at Disease Locus, under Different Genetic Models

Genetic Model, Disease Allele Frequency, and λ_s^a	γ	Proportion of Alleles Shared at Disease Locus
Single locus dominant, frequency .01:		
$\lambda_s = 1.5$	<u>9.4</u>	.530
$\lambda_s = 3.0$	<u>21.1</u>	.566
$\lambda_s = 5.0$	<u>35.0</u>	.595
$\lambda_s = 10.0$	<u>78.1</u>	.646

^a Epistatic models are as defined in table 1.

$$f_1 \left[K_0 \left(\frac{3 - p^2 - 2p}{4} \right) + K_G \left(\frac{1 + 2p + p^2}{4} \right) \right] \quad (A2)$$

$$+ f_2 \left[K_0 \left(1 - \frac{p^2 + p}{4} \right) + K_G \left(\frac{p^2 + p}{4} \right) \right]$$

$$+ f_3 \left[K_0 \left(1 - \frac{p^2}{4} \right) + K_G \left(\frac{p^2}{4} \right) \right].$$

In addition, a programming error resulted in incorrect values for λ_s under the single-locus dominant model in table 2 and for γ under the single-locus dominant model in table 4. The corrected data for tables 2 and 4 are shown underlined in the tables given here. The corrections were minor and had no effect on the inferences drawn from these results. We thank Sabine Loesgen for pointing out these errors to us.